

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 1171-03  
Bill No.: SC S for HB 453  
Subject: Missouri Emergency Response Commission; Department of Natural Resources;  
Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund; Secretary of State Fees; Surface Mining  
Permits; Economic Development; Business and Commerce  
Type: Original  
Date: April 30, 2001

---

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
Chemical Emergency Preparedness Fund	\$0	\$211,060	\$266,604
Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund	\$6,100,980	\$10,975,980	\$4,337,180
Road Fund	\$0	\$0	\$95,000
Secretary of State's Technology Trust Fund Account	\$1,150,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000
Mined Land Reclamation Fund**	\$80,822	\$20,171	\$22,260
General Revenue	(\$4,200)	(\$5,000)	(\$5,000)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on All State Funds</b>	<b>\$7,327,602</b>	<b>\$13,502,211</b>	<b>\$5,051,768</b>

**\*\* DOES NOT REFLECT UNKNOWN HEARING EXPENSES**

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.  
This fiscal note contains 14 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
None	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on All Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 391,971</b>	<b>\$ 495,120</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### Assumptions in reference to the component of the proposal addressing the Emergency Response Commission

In response to similar legislation (HB 453), officials from the **Office of Administration** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

In response to similar legislation (HB 453), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - State Emergency Management Agency** noted that the numbers reflected are based on the collection of fees from prior years. The Chemical Emergency Preparedness Fund is self-supporting at the current fee structure.

Of the fees collected, the Division of Fire Safety receives 10% and this 10% is used for the training of firemen and first responders for hazardous materials incidents. Additionally, local governments receive 65% of the fees collected and, for administration, the Missouri Emergency Response Commission (MERC) receives 25% of the fees collected.

#### Assumptions in reference to the component of the proposal addressing Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund

In response to similar legislation (HCS for HB 327), officials from the **Department of Agriculture** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Administration (COA) - Division of Budget and Planning** assume that the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agency. Officials noted that the proposal would increase total state revenue; however, COA officials defer to the Department of Natural Resources for an estimate of the amount.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue** noted that the Division of Taxation would notify 800 licensees of the increase in the fee and change the reporting forms to reflect the increase. However, officials assume the DOR would use existing resources in making these changes and notifications. Therefore, no administrative fiscal impact is anticipated. DOR officials defer to the Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning to estimate the general revenue impact.

Officials from the **Department of Transportation (DHT)** assume that this proposal will impact their agency as they utilize the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund on tank removals during construction projects. DHT noted that the department has performed insurance-funded cleanups, with an average reimbursement cost of \$95,000. With the extension of the potential reimbursements until 2010, DHT officials assume the department would experience an average of two (2) clean up per year for a total annual reimbursement to the Road Fund of \$190,000.

**Oversight** has reflected six (6) months of cost savings to the Road Fund of \$95,000.

Officials from the **Secretary of State's Office (SOS)** assumes that the Department of Natural Resources shall promulgate rules to implement this proposal. Based on experience with other divisions, the rules, regulations and forms issued by the Department of Natural Resources could require as many as 26 pages in the Code of State Regulations. SOS estimates the cost of a page in the Missouri Register to be \$23.00. The estimated cost of a page in the Code of State Regulations is \$27.00. SOS states that the impact of this legislation in future years is unknown and would depend on the frequency and length of rules filed, amended, rescinded or withdrawn.

**Oversight** assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process. Any decisions to raise fees to defray costs would likely be made in subsequent fiscal years.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assume that the new language added in Section 319.132.3(4) would allow the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund (PSTIF) board to continue funding the department for all activities and work plan items that are currently being funded by the PSTIF board under the DNR Tanks/PSTIF work plan.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The PSTIF Board estimates revenues to remain relatively constant in FY 2005-FY 2010 at approximately the same levels as FY 04. In FY 11, revenues would be half or less, compared to prior years. Revenues would be zero in FY 12 and beyond.

Expenditures from the PSTIF are estimated to be approximately \$20-\$30 million in FY 2005 - FY 2010, decreasing to \$10-20 million in FY 2011-FY 2012 and less than \$10 million annually thereafter until the balance in the fund has been expended in approximately FY 2014.

A number of cash flow projections were provided to the PSTIF Board of Trustees by its third-party administrator. The estimates contained herein are derived from those studies. Assumptions used include the following:

- \* Approximate constant volume of petroleum coming into Missouri annually
- \* Approximate increases of 1% per year in participation by underground tank owners in the PSTIF insurance program through FY 2005, with constant participation thereafter.
- \* Approximate increases of 7% per year in participation by aboveground tank owners in the PSTIF insurance program, through FY 2005 with constant participation thereafter
- \* Approximate increases of 3% annually in state agency and administrative expenses
- \* Additional claims for cleanups of 2,800 old tank sites are received
- \* 1% of insured underground storage tank sites and 2.5% of insured above ground storage tank sites file a claim annually
- \* Claims currently delayed due to funding shortfalls are allowed to begin cleanups during FY 2002
- \* Twenty-five additional large loss claims (exceeding \$250,000) are filed during the life of the program
- \* Environmental cleanup requirements are not substantially changed during the life of the program

**Oversight** assumes, based on previous two-year average of receipts, that ongoing program revenue for half of FY 2004 will be approximately \$9.3 million.

Assumptions in reference to the component of the proposal addressing Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund and filing a claim for a refund of a surcharge

In reference to similar legislation (HB 758), officials from the **Department of Agriculture** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue** assume the proposed legislation would have little or no administrative impact on their department.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources** noted that neither the board nor the department anticipates any direct fiscal impact as a result of this proposal. DNR notes that the PSTIF Board has an existing appropriation for the purpose of refunding erroneously collected receipts. DNR states that the proposal would clarify the format for someone to request a refund of a surcharge that has been paid into the PSTIF if the payment was made in error.

Assumptions in response to the component of the proposal addressing the Secretary of State's Technology Trust Fund Account

Officials from the **Secretary of State's Office**, responded in a similar proposal (HB 938), that without the continuance of collecting fees for the Technology Trust Fund, the Secretary of State would need annual budget expenditures for technology for the offices of the Secretary of State. SOS did not estimate the amount of revenue that would be recognized into the fund resulting from passage of this proposal.

**Oversight** notes that based on information obtained from the Office of Administration - Division of Accounting's Financial Summaries for FY's 1998 through FY 2000, the receipts for the Secretary of State's Technology Trust Fund Account for FY 1998 were \$2,300,375, for FY 1999 were \$2,243,058 and for FY 2000 were \$2,332,062. Averaging the receipts for the noted fiscal years, the fund is averaging fiscal year receipts of approximately \$2,291,832 or approximately \$2,300,000. Using this \$2,300,000, **Oversight** assumes the receipts for this fund for FY 2002 will be \$1,150,000 and for FYs 2003 and 2004 will be \$2,300,000. In FY 2002 the receipts are prorated at six (6) months due to the fact that per current law the fees would expire on December 31, 2001. Therefore, the fiscal impact in FY 2002 is only six (6) months.

Assumptions in response to the component of the proposal addressing the surface mining permits

In response to similar legislation (HCS for HB 239), officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** and the **Office of Attorney General** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agencies.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources** (DNR) noted that currently, section 444.772.10 limits the fee for an industrial minerals permit by statute to a maximum of \$500 (currently \$350) for each permit to include all sites under that permit, plus \$40 for each acre under permit. This legislation will increase to a maximum of \$600 per permit plus each site not to exceed \$300. In addition, each bonded acre under the permit will require a maximum \$10 fee.  
ASSUMPTION (continued)

For operators whose bonded acres exceed 100 acres, those acres will require a maximum \$5 fee.

There is also a maximum of \$2500 per permit in fees. Sand and gravel operators who mine less than 5000 tons annually shall be \$300. These fees shall be set to recover the costs of administering and enforcing the provisions of the law. Each year the director shall submit a report to the commission and the public that describes the number of employees and the activities performed the previous calendar year. Officials noted that permits are renewed yearly.

Currently Section 444.773.B, RSM o, allows the department to hold a public hearing only if a person's health, safety or livelihood is affected by noncompliance with any applicable laws or regulations. The department has received numerous requests for public hearings throughout the years, but has denied these requests in accordance with the present statutory criteria (allowing a hearing only if a noncompliance affects a person). The department has held only one hearing related to a surface mining permit.

The proposed legislation grants a public meeting if requested by interested persons and also allows them to request a public hearing, as defined by Chapter 536, RSM o, if requested by any interested person. The department assumes the proposed legislation would apply to any permit action which would meet the public notice requirements. The department averages approximately 60 new applications per year; last calendar year the department received 70 new applications.

Officials estimate that about one-half of these applications will result in a public meeting, and about six of these may result in a public hearing, as required in RSM o 444.880. Due to the public interest in new permits the department anticipates many requests for meetings.

After holding a public meeting, interested parties may request a public hearing. Under the current criterion, the department has never denied a land reclamation mining permit. But due to the sensitivity of the new criterion, that an interested party's health, safety or livelihood will be unduly impaired by the issuance of the permit, to request a public meeting or hearing, the department assumes there would be an increase in the number of permits going through the permit appeals process.

The department would request one (1) additional FTE to carry out the duties related to arranging meeting places and time, research time, and presentation of the department's permit position.

The department does not have the necessary resources to implement the proposed legislation. In addition, if the actual number of public meetings exceeds these projections the department may need to request additional resources.

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

The department would request one Land Reclamation Specialist to investigate requests for the public hearings, gather information concerning requests, schedule the public hearings, present

and verify such evidence before the hearing officer, and then communicate findings to the Land Reclamation Commission.

**Oversight** has reduced the personal service costs and the expense and equipment costs submitted by the DNR to reflect those costs used in the fiscal note for a similar proposal from the 2000 session, and then increased these costs for inflation.

Assumptions in response to the component of the proposal addressing establishing the "Advisory Committee for Electronic Commerce" within the Department of Economic Development

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume the proposal would not have a fiscal impact on their agency. However, DOR does believe that this proposal would duplicate efforts of an existing advisory board under the Office of Administration - Office of Information Technology entitled the "Information Technology Advisory Board." DOR states that this board has formed several committees and subcommittees, one of which is an "E-Government Committee." The committee includes representatives from the following agencies: Department of Social Services, Office of Information Technology, Office of Administration, Department of Revenue, State Treasurers' Office, State Courts Administrator's Office, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Secretary of State.

Officials from the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Office of Administration - divisions of Budget and Planning and Office of Information Technology** assume this proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development (DED)** assume that the 11-member committee will meet four times in the first year to organize and begin business, and then meet at least quarterly thereafter. In accordance with the proposal the members of the committee will receive reimbursement for expenses only. DED estimates the expense reimbursement as follows:

Mileage: It is estimated that 10 members of the 11-member committee will drive an average of 240 miles round trip to attend committee meetings. 240 miles round trip x 4 meetings per fiscal year x \$.295 mileage reimbursement rate x 10 = \$2,832.00 (10 x 240 x 4 x .295) total mileage reimbursement.

Lodging: \$75 hotel cost per night @ 2 nights stay (2 nights per meeting) for 10 members

ASSUMPTION (continued)

= \$6,000 (75 x 2 x 4 x 10).

Meals: \$35 daily meal allowance x 4 meeting per year x 2 days per meeting x 10 attendees = \$2,800. Also, \$22 dinner meal for evening prior to meeting x 4 meeting per year x 10 members = \$880 total dinner meal for evening prior to meeting. Therefore, total meal allowance is \$3,680 ((35 x 4 x 2 x 10) + (22 x 10 x 4)).

DED assumes the total reimbursable expenses incurred by the committee members will total roughly \$13,000 per year.

**Oversight** assumes many of the meetings will occur in Jefferson City and therefore, mileage, lodging, and meal allowances will not be as high as the DED has estimated. Oversight estimates that members of the committee will be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred and would total roughly \$5,000 per fiscal year.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2002	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004
<b>CHEMICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND</b>			
<u>Income - Department of Public Safety</u>			
Continuance of fee collection due to extension of sunset date	\$0	\$603,031	\$761,724
<u>Cost - Department of Public Safety</u>			
Distribution to local government	\$0	(\$391,971)	(\$495,120)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON CHEMICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$211,060</u>	<u>\$266,604</u>

**PETROLEUM STORAGE TANK  
INSURANCE FUND (PSTIF)**

<u>Revenue - PSTIF</u>			
Increase of Transport Load Fee	\$7,125,000	\$14,250,000	\$14,250,000



<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2002	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004 (6 Mo.)
Continuance of collection due to extension of sunset date	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$9,225,589</u>
Estimated <u>Revenue</u> to PSTIF	<u>\$7,125,000</u>	<u>\$14,250,000</u>	<u>\$23,475,589</u>
<u>Cost - PSTIF</u>			
Other Fund Costs (Administrative)			
Due to increase in the fee	(\$124,020)	(\$241,020)	(\$404,820)
Due to continuation of fund	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$2,901,654)</u>
<u>Other Costs (Program Distribution)</u>			
Due to increase in fee and extension of participation in the fund	(\$900,000)	(\$3,033,000)	(\$9,508,000)
Due to continuation of fund	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$8,288,211)</u>
Estimated <u>Cost</u> to PSTIF	<u>(\$1,024,020)</u>	<u>(\$3,274,020)</u>	<u>(\$21,102,685)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON PETROLEUM STORAGE TANK INSURANCE FUND</b>	<b><u>\$6,100,980</u></b>	<b><u>\$10,975,980</u></b>	<b><u>\$2,372,904</u></b>

## ROAD FUND

<u>Savings</u> - Department of Transportation			
Continued reimbursement for cleanups	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$95,000</u>

## SECRETARY OF STATE'S TECHNOLOGY TRUST FUND ACCOUNT

<u>Income</u> - Continuation of fee collection	<u>\$1,150,000</u>	<u>\$2,300,000</u>	<u>\$2,300,000</u>
<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2002	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004

## MINED LAND RECLAMATION FUND

<u>Income</u> - Department of Natural Resources	\$166,322	\$200,388	\$200,388
Permit Fee Restructuring			

Estimated <u>Income</u> to MLRF	<u>\$166,322</u>	<u>\$200,388</u>	<u>\$200,388</u>
<u>Costs</u> - Department of Natural Resources			
Personal Service (1 FTE)	\$0	(\$37,526)	(\$38,464)
Fringe Benefits	\$0	(\$12,507)	(\$12,820)
Expense and Equipment	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$12,764)</u>	<u>(\$5,901)</u>
	\$0	(\$62,797)	(\$57,185)
<u>Other Costs</u> - Department of Natural Resources		(\$117,420) to	(\$120,943) to
Hearing Expenses	<u>(\$85,500)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
Estimated <u>Costs</u> to MLRF	<u>(\$85,500)</u>	<u>(\$180,217)</u>	<u>(\$178,128)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON MINED LAND RECLAMATION FUND**</b>	<b><u>\$80,822</u></b>	<b><u>\$20,171</u></b>	<b><u>\$22,260</u></b>

**\*\* DOES NOT REFLECT UNKNOWN HEARING EXPENSES**

#### **GENERAL REVENUE**

<u>Costs</u> - Reimbursable expenses for performance of committee	<u>(\$4,200)</u>	<u>(\$5,000)</u>	<u>(\$5,000)</u>
--	------------------	------------------	------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2002	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004
---	---------	---------------------	---------

#### **Local Government**

<u>Income</u> - Local Government	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$391,971</u>	<u>\$495,120</u>
Fees received from Department of Public Safety			

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

In reference to the component addressing the Emergency Response Commission, those small businesses currently paying fees for storage of hazardous materials would be fiscally impacted as a result of this proposal. In reference to the component of the proposal addressing the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund and the surface mining permits, small businesses could be affected by the provisions of this proposal. In reference to the component of the proposal addressing the

additional fees collected by the Secretary of State's Office, would result in an unknown impact to small businesses. In reference to the component of the proposal addressing the "Advisory Committee for Electronic Commerce," no direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

## DESCRIPTION

This proposal:

1. Extends fee collection for the Missouri Emergency Response Commission.
2. Extends the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund.
3. Extends the collection of additional \$5 fees by the Secretary of State's Office for the Technology Trust Fund.
4. Makes numerous changes to surface mining laws.
5. Establishes the "Advisory Committee for Electronic Commerce" within the Department of Economic Development.

(Number 1)

Fees for the Missouri Emergency Response Commission expire on August 28, 2002. This proposal extends the fees to August 28, 2012.

(Number 2)

The Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund expires on December 31, 2003. This proposal extends the fund to December 31, 2010. Thereafter, the fund's board of trustees may function only to complete payment of claims made prior to the expiration date. Current law allows the board to set, by rule, the surcharge paid into the fund for each petroleum transport load. The proposal allows the board to adjust the surcharge after 60 days notice and an opportunity for public comment. The maximum surcharge is increased from \$25 to \$60 per load. If the fund's balance exceeds its liabilities by 10% on the first day of any month, the surcharge reverts to \$25 per load on the first day of the second month following this event.

Monies generated by this surcharge shall not be used for any purposes other than those outlined in sections 319.129 through 319.133 and section 319.138.

## DESCRIPTION (continued)

The board, in consultation with the Department of Natural Resources, may prioritize claims and expenditures from the fund. Tank owners and operators may continue participating in the fund after transferring their property to another party.

The proposal states that funds will be provided for the cleanup of contamination caused by petroleum storage tanks if, by August 28, 2000, the owner or operator was already participating

in the fund or had made application for participation in the fund. This is an extension of current law, which set this date at December 31, 1997.

The proposed legislation allows individuals who may have made an erroneous surcharge payment to the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund to file a refund claim with the fund's board of trustees. Claims must be filed within three years of making the payment. Individuals aggrieved by the board's decision may seek judicial review through the circuit court of Cole County no later than 60 days after the decision.

(Number 3)

This proposal extends the \$5 fees collected by the Secretary of State for the Technology Trust to December 31, 2009. Currently the Fund will expire on December 31, 2001.

(Number 4)

This proposal establishes the Advisory Committee for Electronic Commerce within the Department of Economic Development (DED) for the purpose of advising state agencies on issues related to electronic commerce. The Director of the DED chairs the Committee and appoints 10 other members in accordance with certain specified criteria. Members are appointed for two-year terms and the Committee is required to meet at least twice per year.

(Number 5)

This proposal makes numerous changes to surface mining law.

## PERMIT FEES

Current law establishes annual fees for most surface mining permits at \$350 plus \$40 for each individual site mined during the year. There is also a fee of \$35 per acre when a permit application is originally filed. The Land Reclamation Commission may increase the basic annual fee to \$500. Gravel mine operators removing less than 5,000 tons per year pay \$100 plus \$35 per acre annually. The substitute allows the commission to establish fees that recover costs of administration and enforcement, with a basic annual fee cap of \$600 and additional annual fees of no more than \$10 per acre and \$300 per site. The fee for each acre over 100 is reduced by 50%, and the site fee is reduced by 50% if mining occurs for less than six months of the year.

### DESCRIPTION (continued)

Total annual fees for each permit are capped at \$2,500. Gravel mine operators removing less than 5,000 tons per year pay \$300 annually. All fees expire on December 31, 2007.

## PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

Under current law, applicants for surface mining permits are required to publish a notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the local area, interested parties may submit written

comments to the Department of Natural Resources or request a public hearing for 15 days after the application is filed, and the department must forward a recommendation on the permit to the commission by the end of the public comment period. The substitute requires applicants to publish a notice once a week for four weeks, beginning no more than 10 days after the application is complete. Applicants are also required to notify by certified mail the local governing body and owners of property adjacent to the proposed surface mine. Notices must include a statement that interested parties may submit written comments to the department or request a public meeting or a formal hearing for up to 15 days after the end of the public notice period.

The department must forward its recommendation on the permit to the commission within four weeks after the end of the public notice period. If a public meeting was requested and the applicant agrees, the department and applicant will conduct the meeting within 30 days after the end of the comment period, and the department will make a recommendation to the commission within 30 days after the meeting. If issues are not resolved at the public meeting and a formal public hearing is requested, the commission may conduct a hearing. The commission may deny the permit if there is substantial evidence that the applicant has a reasonable likelihood of noncompliance or that mine operations will impair the health, safety, or livelihood of an interested party.

## RECLAMATION STANDARDS

Currently, surface mine operators must begin reclamation as soon as possible after commencement of mining and, after their permit expires, complete grading within 12 months and seeding and planting within 24 months. The substitute requires operators to begin reclamation as soon as possible after completion of mining in a portion of their permitted area and to complete grading within 12 months and seeding and planting within 24 months.

The department may require erosion control measures on overburden stockpiles if the erosion is causing damage outside the permitted area. Grading and replacing topsoil may not be required in rugged areas intended for wildlife habitats or in areas reclaimed for industrial use. To reclaim land mined previously as a substitute for reclaiming currently mined land, operators must submit

## DESCRIPTION (continued)

a plan and provide written permission of the landowner.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

## SOURCES OF INFORMATION

KLR:LR:OD (12/00)

Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Public Safety - State Emergency Management Agency  
Office of Attorney General  
Office of State Courts Administrator  
Department of Transportation  
Department of Revenue  
Secretary of State's Office  
Office of Administration  
    Budget and Planning  
    Office of Information Technology  
Department of Economic Development  
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations  
Department of Agriculture



Jeanne Jarrett, CPA  
Director

April 30, 2001